Amendment Dated: July 30, 2007

Reply to Office Action Mailed: April 30, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 029267.55488US

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are

respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3 and 5-10 remain pending, wherein claims 1,

8 and 10 are amended.

Claims 1, 3 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

for indefiniteness. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

This rejection is based on the recitation of the high-speed module board

and the advance function module board in claim 1. Although it is respectfully

submitted that the recitation of these elements in claim 1 is clear and definite,

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite that the multilayer module board is one

of (i) a low-end module board, (ii) high-speed module board or (iii) an advanced

function module board, and that the base board is connected to one of these

boards. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this amendment addresses

the issues identified in the Office Action, and this ground of rejection should be

withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated

by U.S. Patent No. 6,477,593 to Khosrowpour et al. ("Khosrowpour"). This

ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Page 7 of 13

Amendment Dated: July 30, 2007

Reply to Office Action Mailed: April 30, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 029267.55488US

Khosrowpour does not anticipate Applicant's claim 1 because

Khosrowpour does not disclose the multilayer module board recited in this claim.

In particular, Khosrowpour does not disclose a multilayer module board that

includes at least a CPU and a memory. Nor does Khosrowpour disclose a

multilayer module board that is one of a low-end module board, a high-speed

module board or an advanced function module board.

Khosrowpour discloses a stacked input/output bridge circuit assembly

having flexibly configurable connections. Specifically, daughterboards 120 and

130 can be stacked on motherboard 110. (Col. 4, lines 12-13). The

daughterboards "may comprise boards employing using through-hole or surface-

mounted devices on single or multi-layer printed circuit boards (PCBs), as well

as more exotic board structures constructed using, for example, thick-film or co-

fired ceramic technologies." (Col. 4, lines 17-21). Khosrowpour does not,

however, disclose that daughterboards 120 and 130 include at least a CPU and

memory, or that they are one of a low-end module board, a high-speed module

board or an advanced function module board.

To reject Applicant's claim 1 the Office Action cites Figure 1 of

Khosrowpour. However, Figure 1 of Khosrowpour does not identify the type of

components that are included on daughterboards 120 and 130. Nor does Figure

Page 8 of 13

Amendment Dated: July 30, 2007

Reply to Office Action Mailed: April 30, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 029267.55488US

1 of Khosrowpour disclose that these daughterboards are one of a low-end

module board, a high-speed module board or an advanced function module board.

Regarding anticipation, M.P.E.P. § 2131, citing Verdegaal Bros. v. Union

Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987),

states that

[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described,

in a single prior art reference.

Furthermore, as discussed in M.P.E.P. § 2112, citing In re Robertson, 169

F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999):

[t]o establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence 'must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in

the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may

not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is

not sufficient.'

However, there is nothing in the disclosure of Khosrowpour that expressly

or inherently discloses that daughterboards 120 and 130 include at least a CPU

and memory, or that they are one of a low-end module board, a high-speed

module board or an advanced function module board. Accordingly, Khosrowpour

cannot anticipate Applicant's claim 1.

Page 9 of 13

Amendment Dated: July 30, 2007

Reply to Office Action Mailed: April 30, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 029267.55488US

Claim 5 is patentably distinguishable over Khosrowpour at least by virtue

of its dependency from claim 1.

For at least those reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that

the rejection of claims 1 and 5 as being anticipated by Khosrowpour be

withdrawn.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the

combination of Khosrowpour and U.S. Patent No. 6,085,137 to Aruga et al.

("Aruga"). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1. As discussed above, Khosrowpour does not

disclose all of the elements of Applicant's claim 1. It is respectfully submitted

that Aruga does not remedy the above-identified deficiencies of Khosrowpour.

Accordingly, the combination of Khosrowpour and Aruga cannot render claim 3,

which depends from claim 1, obvious.

For at least those reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that

the rejection of claim 3 as being obvious in view of the combination of

Khosrowpour and Aruga be withdrawn.

Page 10 of 13

Amendment Dated: July 30, 2007

Reply to Office Action Mailed: April 30, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 029267.55488US

Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view

of the combination of Khosrowpour and U.S. Patent No. 5,346,402 to Yasuho et

al. ("Yasuho"). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6-8 variously depend from claim 1. As discussed above,

Khosrowpour does not disclose all of the elements of Applicant's claim 1. It is

respectfully submitted that Yasuho does not remedy the above-identified

deficiencies of Khosrowpour. Accordingly, the combination of Khosrowpour and

Yasuho cannot render claims 6-8, which depend from claim 1, obvious.

Moreover, the combination of Khosrowpour and Yasuho does not disclose

or suggest that "the four connector terminals are each carried with the base

portion attached to a transfer adapter and the four connector terminals are

connected through soldering onto a rear surface of the board while attached to

the transfer adapter" as recited in claims 7 and 9.

Independent claims 9 and 10, like claim 1, each recite a multilayer module

board that includes a CPU and a memory. Accordingly, for similar reasons to

those discussed above with regard to claim 1, the combination of Khosrowpour

and Yasuho cannot render these claims obvious.

Page 11 of 13

Amendment Dated: July 30, 2007

Reply to Office Action Mailed: April 30, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 029267.55488US

Furthermore, independent claims 9 and 10 each also recite that "the

plurality of high-frequency electronic components are connected with one

another through a wiring pattern formed at an inner layer thereof." This claim

element is also not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Khosrowpour

and Yasuho. It appears that the rejection of these claims relies upon

Khosrowpour as disclosing this element. The Office Action, however, does not

provide any citations as to where this claim element can be found in

Khosrowpour. Accordingly, if this ground of rejection is maintained, Applicant

respectfully requests that the next Office Action provide such a citation.

Moreover, claims 8 and 10 each recite a multilayer board module

comprising connector terminals each of which include aligning pins projecting at

both ends of the base portion to be used when soldering the connector terminal

onto a rear surface of the board, and a pair of positioning holes at which the

aligning pins are loosely fitted formed at each of the four corners of the board.

These elements are not disclosed or suggested by the combination of

Khosrowpour and Yasuho.

For at least those reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that

the rejection of claims 6-10 as being obvious in view of the combination of

Khosrowpour and Yasuho be withdrawn.

Page 12 of 13

Amendment Dated: July 30, 2007

Reply to Office Action Mailed: April 30, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 029267.55488US

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in

general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this

should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as

a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and

please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit

Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #029267.55488US).

Respectfully submitted,

July 30, 2007

Stephen W. Palan

Registration No. 43,420

CROWELL & MORING LLP

Intellectual Property Group

P.O. Box 14300

Washington, DC 20044-4300

Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500

Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844

SWP:crr

3916855